



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/799,607	03/15/2004	Hiroshi Yasuda	116692005400	8412
25227	7590	03/26/2007	EXAMINER	
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP 1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD SUITE 400 MCLEAN, VA 22102			TRAN, QUOC A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	
			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			03/26/2007 PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/799,607	YASUDA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tran A. Quoc	2176

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 07 March 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
 - a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 - b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 - (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 - (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1, 3, 5-6, 7, and 9-12.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. Other: _____.

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Quoc A. Tran
 Patent Examiner 03-20-2007

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's request for reconsideration filed on March 07, 2007, have been consider but does not place the application in condition for allowance. Beginning on page 2 of 3 of the REMARKS (hereinafter the remarks), Applicant argues the following issues, which are accordingly addressed below.

Regarding rejection of claims 1 and 7, the Applicant argues that the Tsuji fails to teach, "that the printing part prints identifier information, by which the handwritten information acquiring part identifies the format of the document." (the remarks page 2-middle). The examiner disagrees, as disclosing in the final rejection (mailed 02-08-2007), specifically, Tsuji discloses he letter Z serving as an identification ID of the form P is printed beforehand at the upper left corner of the form P. When the letter Z in the form P is traced by the input pen 10, the main unit 20 can determine the coordinates of a series of points constituting a part of the locus of the letter Z. Next, "Mr. Kenzo", "Printer", "\$4,000" are entered into boxes in the form P. The main unit 20 determines coordinates of a series of points constituting a part of each of these entered letters or characters. These determined coordinates are stored in the data storage unit 44 in pen-stroke blocks (see Tsuji Fig. 6 and para 69).

In addition, Tsuji discloses although the letter Z is printed in a paper form beforehand as a form ID in the above-described embodiment, it is also possible to print four lines crossing each other in a paper form as shown in FIG. 7 to identify its form type by detecting the number of the lines traced and the tracing order. It is also possible to identify a form type by writing a form ID into a predetermined area of a paper form without printing a form ID beforehand. In this case, a specific box to filled in a form ID may be printed in the form (see Tsuji Fig. 7 and para 82).

Using the broadest reasonable interpretation, the Examiner reads the claimed the printing part prints identifier information as equivalent to a form ID may be printed in the form as taught by Tsuji.
It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. See, MPEP 2123.

For at least all the above evidence, therefore the Examiner respectfully maintains the rejection of independent claims 1, and 7. Accordingly, the dependent claims 3, 5-6, and 9-12 also rejected at this time.

William J. Bashore
WILLIAM BASMORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER